



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/706,303 | 11/10/2003 | Satoshi Mizutani | 20050/0200479-US0 | 5755 |
| 7278 | 7590 | 08/10/2007 | | |
| DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770 | | | EXAMINER REICHLE, KARIN M | |
| | | | ART UNIT 3761 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 08/10/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,303

Applicant(s)

MIZUTANI ET AL.

Examiner

Karin M. Reichle

Art Unit

3761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8, 10, 11, 15-17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-7, 9, 12-14, 18 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The following Office Action is based on the substitute specification and marked-up specification filed 1-26-07, including the abstract, the drawings filed 11-8-05, the claims filed 9-21-06 and the remarks filed 9-21-06.

Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 8, 10-11, 15-17 and 19-20 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6-8-05. New claims 22-23 are also withdrawn. Claims 19-20 are still withdrawn since claim 19 claims a body facing adhesive which is not shown in the Figures of the elected species and Applicant did not set forth that such claims read on the elected species, see page 3, last full paragraph of the 5-11-05 election requirement. In the 9-21-06 remarks Applicants now further refer to specific paragraphs on specific pages of the substitute specification. However, the paragraphs referred to are not present on the pages set forth, e.g. paragraph 194 is on page 35, not 36 of the 1-21-06 substitute specification, and such paragraphs, regardless of what page they are on, do not describe the adhesion nor materials of the mini-sheet. Therefore such arguments are deemed not persuasive. New claim 22, and thereby claim 23 which depends therefrom, recites the mini-sheet bonded to the opposite face at the lateral sides and at the side of the another end of the cavity. As best understood the bonding at the side of the another end of the

Art Unit: 3761

cavity which is claimed separate from that of the lateral sides is the bonding at the longitudinal end of the mini-sheet adjacent the another end of the cavity. Applicant relies on Figures 1-4 and 14(B) as support. However, as shown and described, the longitudinal end of the mini-sheet is not bonded at the side of the another end of the cavity, i.e. 27B is a non-bonded area. Therefore, claim 22 does not appear to read on the elected species of the mini-sheet of Figure 14B.

Specification

3. The substitute specification, including the abstract, filed 1-26-07 has not been entered because it does not comply with 37 CFR 1.121, e.g. doesn't show all additions by underlining, see paragraph 122 of the clean and marked up copies of the 1-26-07 specification, and the "clean" copy is also not clean, e.g. see paragraph 122 of the "clean" copy of the specification. Since the Figures as filed 11-8-05 are described by the not entered substitute specification these Figures have again not been approved. It is also noted that the amendments, e.g., to the Summary of the Invention section appear to included new matter. For example, the marked up paragraphs 19-23 have been amended to remove referral to a particular embodiment, i.e. 1), so that the combination of the invention described in paragraph 23 is no longer with that of the pad as described in paragraph 19. See similarly amended marked up paragraphs 28-29, 31-32 33-34, 39-40, 41-42, 45-50, 52-59, 61-62, 64-65 and 69-70. Therefore, see the discussion in paragraphs 4-9 *infra*.

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

For Example:

Drawings

5. The drawings were received on November 8, 2005. These drawings are still not approved by the Examiner, see the discussion *supra*.

6. The drawings are objected to because in Figures 2-4, the labels X-X, Y-Y and Z-Z should be avoided. Also the cross-sectional lines, e.g. in Figure 1, X-X, Y-Y and Z-Z, should be denoted by Roman or Arabic numerals, not letters. Figures 13A-D do not show a diagram as set forth on page 15. In Figures 1-6 and 8, the line from 8 should be dashed to denote underlying structure. In Figures 10-12, 8 should clearly denote the restriction, e.g. a line from the numeral thereto rather than a general arrow. In Figure 20, the lines from 38 and 39 should be arrows. Figure 31 should be labeled PRIOR ART. In Figure 27, the numeral 6 should clearly denote the cavity. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

Art Unit: 3761

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Description

7. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are: the abstract.

8. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be limited to a single paragraph. Also terminology which can be inferred, e.g. "The present invention relates to", "according to the present invention", should be avoided. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification is replete with informalities. For example: 1) On page 3, line 9, "Disclosure of the Invention" should be --Summary of the Invention--. 2) On page 31, line 19, "21" should be --38--. 3) The Summary of the Invention section, i.e. a description of the claimed invention, and the invention of the claims is not commensurate in scope, see MPEP 608.01(d). (It is noted that the substitute specification filed 1-26-07 still did not provide such a Summary section.) 4) On page 18, line 8, "Best Mode of Carrying Out the Invention" should be --Detailed Description of the Invention--. 5) The use of a confusing variety of terms for the same thing should be avoided. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3761

608.01(o). For example, see title and page 1, lines 13-15, i.e. "Package" or "wrapping body" and "wrapping container"? The specification should be carefully reviewed and revised, as necessary, to overcome all the informalities. Applicant is thanked in advance for the cooperation in placing the specification in proper form.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

10. Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 12-14, 18 and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, line 5, after "face", change ":", to --, the cavity being formed in between the opposite face and a mini-sheet; and--. On lines 6-7, change "a cavity" to --a cavity opening at one end of the cavity and a finger restriction portion formed at another end of the cavity, the--. On lines 6-7, change "at...and" to --,--. On line 8, change "a mini-sheet which covers" to --wherein the mini-sheet covers-- and "across" to --from--. On line 9, change "having" to --has--. On lines 5 and 9, "on" should be --of--. Change lines 11-13 to --wherein the finger restriction portion is adapted to stop the fingertip inserted therein at a position corresponding to a position of a vagina of a wearer,--. Change lines 14-16 to --wherein the finger restriction portion is defined by two facing portions of a fold formed in the opposite face which are bonded to each other at least at a respective portion thereof,--. On the last line, change "finger" to --fingertip--. In claim 21, as best understood, should "wherein--cavity" on lines 2-3 be --wherein the mini-sheet is attached as to be in direct contact with the opposite face portions covered thereby except for the cavity formed therebetween--? Also the last two lines of claim 2

Art Unit: 3761

appear to be redundant, see claim 1, lines 17-18. In claim 18, line 2, "piece" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 7 now requires a pad as claimed in claim 1 wherein the cavity opening is disposed a first specific percentage from the front end of the pad and the finger restriction portion is disposed at a second specific percentage from the front end. See Claim Language Interpretation section *infra*. While the original specification at page 8, lines 21-26 and the paragraph bridging pages 29-30 disclose a pad as claimed in claim 1 with ranges of first specific percentages and ranges of second specific percentages when in labial pads of certain ranges of length, this is not what is claimed. Where is a device as claimed in claim 1 in combination with such a first specific percentage and such a second specific percentage only disclosed in a single embodiment in the original application? For example, where does the original application disclose a pad of any length having an opening and restriction as claimed in claim 7 and that such configuration will stop the finger as set forth at Figure 8, page 4, lines 9-15, page 5, lines 1-6? If Applicant maintains such language the portion of the specification which provides support for the full scope of the claimed combination in a single embodiment should be set forth. See also the rejection of claim 7 *infra*. In the 9-21-06 response Applicants now further refer to specific paragraphs on specific pages of the substitute specification. However, the paragraphs

referred to are not present on the pages set forth, e.g. paragraph 120 is not on page 21 of the substitute specification, and such paragraphs, regardless of what page they are on, do not describe the features argued. Therefore such arguments are deemed not persuasive. Applicants remarks of 9-06 with regard to the interpretation of the terminology “end” are also narrower than broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the original specification, see portions thereof referred to in paragraph 12 infra with respect to claim 7, i.e. the terminology “front end” is not limited to the front end edge only.

Claim Language Interpretation

12. The claim terminology is interpreted in light of the specific definitions on page 5, lines 7-17. Any other claim language not specifically defined has been interpreted in view of the usual and common meaning of such, i.e. the dictionary definition. Lines 11-12 of claim 1 now require that the restriction at an end of the cavity is adapted to stop the finger at a position “corresponding” to the vagina. “Corresponding” as defined by the dictionary is “to be similar, parallel, equivalent or equal in character, quantity, origin, structure or function”. Since terminology is interpreted broadly, such terminology is interpreted as “similar” and “similar” is defined as “related in appearance or nature, alike though not identical”. Therefore, absent claiming of a specific position relative to the pad, the terminology “corresponding” is considered relative. The specification is considered to provide support for such because it discloses a restriction is in the vicinity of the vagina at Figure 8, page 4, lines 9-15, page 5, lines 1-6, which as best understood disclose that the cavity has a restriction portion at an end thereof adapted to stop the finger at a point which point is such that a portion of the finger, i.e. the ball thereof,

Art Unit: 3761

substantially corresponds, e.g. see Figure 8 of the application, to the position of a vagina of a wearer when the pad is appropriately applied, i.e. the point at which the finger is stopped does not correspond to the vagina but to a point which is rearward thereof. It is noted that if Applicant is attempting to claim the point being equivalent or equal to, i.e. the same as, the position of vagina the specification does not appear to disclose such. It is noted that claim 1 does not require the restriction be at a longitudinal end of the cavity. It is also noted that the cavity is not claimed as being defined in the opposite face. It is noted that the bonding claimed on lines 15-16 of claim 1 includes indirect as well as direct bonding and the specifics of the extent and location of the portions other than having to be "facing" have also not been claimed, i.e. does not preclude bonding by monolithic formation, i.e. does not require direct but not monolithic bonding of portions which are spaced or separated from one another, i.e. can be coextensive portions of fold. Finally it is noted that the claims do not require the insertion of the finger in the cavity for applying the pad to the wearer. Also the specific dimensions of the terminology "mini" have not been set forth, i.e. "mini" only requires the sheet be smaller than some portion of the remainder of the pad. It is noted that claim 7 does not require any specifics of the front end of the pad, e.g. shape, dimensions with regard to the overall pad, etc. It is further noted that the terminology "front end" is not necessarily the front end edge. Note for instance the description at page 8, line 22 and page 9, line 16 of the original specification and original claim 7, i.e. "end" is not necessarily the same as "end edge" in light of the specification. It is also noted that the claim does not require the opening and restriction be only at such percentage from the front end. Therefore, claim 7 is interpreted to require at least some portion of the cavity opening be at a location 40% from some portion of the pad which is in the front end, i.e. the front 50%, and that

Art Unit: 3761

at least some portion of the restriction be at a location 90% from some portion of the pad which is in the front end, i.e. the front 50%. Also the terminology "by a predetermined distance" in claim 9 is considered relative absent the claiming of specifics thereof. Claim 21 is interpreted to require a mini-sheet attached so as to be in direct contact with the opposite face portions it covers except for the cavity defined therebetween in addition to the pad of claim 1. Noted also Response to Arguments section infra.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

14. Claims 1, 6-7, 9, 12-14, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wierlacher '093.

Claim 1: See Claim Language Interpretation section supra and '093 at Figures, especially Figures 2-3, 5b, and 6-9, page 4, first full paragraph, page 6, lines 15-23, page 7, lines 3-30, page 8, lines 12-17, page 9, lines 8-10 and third full paragraph, page 14, line 18-page 15, line 26, page 16, second and third full paragraphs, sentence bridging pages 17-18, page 19, line 8-page 22, line 22, page 24, line 3-page 26, line 18, page 26, line 26-page 27, line 1, i.e. the pad is at least absorbent layer 24 which is adjacent the pudendal region and received in the groove between the labia majora, i.e. an absorbent interlabial pad, and which has an elongate shape with longitudinal and lateral directions, a face side adapted to face the body, adjacent 20a, and an opposite face adapted to face the garment, adjacent 20b, a cavity, i.e. defined by ridge 50, see portions denoted 46, 48, 50 in Figure 1, 46 and 48 in Figure 2, 56 and 54 in Figure 3, 50-56 in Figure 5b, formed

Art Unit: 3761

on the opposite face along a longitudinal direction into which a finger is inserted, see cited portions, e.g., page 20, first full paragraph, the cavity being formed between the opposite face and the mini-sheet piece, see Figures 2 and 5b, and page 9, lines 8-10 and the paragraph bridging pages 26-27, and a cavity opening, between 58 and 40, see again page 20, first full paragraph, at an end of the cavity, i.e. the front of the ridge 50, and a finger restriction portion at another end of the cavity, e.g. adjacent 48, in the longitudinal direction, i.e. see the longitudinal position of 48 as compared to end of 40 in Figure 2, wherein the mini-sheet, e.g. 58, covers a portion of the opposite face from one lateral side to the other and has a length in the longitudinal direction (Note again the Claim Language Interpretation section supra especially with respect to the terminology “mini”), the finger restriction portion is defined by two facing portions of a fold, i.e. bending lines of ridge 50, formed in the opposite face which are bonded, i.e. directly or indirectly to each other at least at a respective portion thereof (see Claim Language Interpretation section supra and portions of opposite face adjacent 48 with respect to the bending lines of ridge 50, Figures 2 and 6, e.g. portions of opposite face on opposite sides of bending lines at 48 are monolithically formed with each other), the mini-sheet covers a part of the opposite face that includes the another end of the cavity at which the two portions of the opposite face are bonded to each other, see Figure 2 and note that 58 covers a part of the outer face, i.e. a part of the ridge and the ridge includes the another end as claimed (Note the claim language does not require the mini-sheet cover the another end and/or the two portions. However also note page 9, lines 8-10 and the paragraph bridging pages 26-27) and the cross sectional area of the cavity gradually narrows in a direction of the another end, i.e. adjacent 48 the cavity is narrows in width along the Z-axis, see Figure 2 in the Z-direction from 58 to 48 (Note the claim does not require narrowing

Art Unit: 3761

only from the opening to the another end or along the longitudinal axis). Claim 1, lines 1, 5, 6-7, 11-12 and last line recite function, capability or property of the structure therein. Note again the Claim Language Interpretation section with regard to the terminology “corresponding”. It is also noted that the claim does not set forth the position of the finger restriction portion relative to any specific points, positions or structure of the pad, i.e. a restriction portion anywhere on the opposite face which stops the finger is capable of stopping the finger at a position corresponding to the vagina depending on how the pad is positioned, nor the specifics of how the pad is positioned/used, i.e. the claim does not require such restriction portion to so position the finger relative to the vagina when the pad is applied at the correct point of wear as detected by the wearer with the ball of the finger so stopped through the pad. Therefore, and in light of the portions of ‘093 cited supra, it is the Examiner’s first position that the ‘093 reference explicitly teaches such function, capability or property. In any case, i.e. the Examiner’s second position, as noted supra the claim language recites functions, properties or capabilities of the structure set forth in claim 1. The ‘093 reference at the very least teaches the structure of claim 1. Therefore there is sufficient factual evidence for one to conclude that such same structure of ‘093 also inherently includes such claimed functions, properties and capabilities, see MPEP 2112.01. Note again the Claim Language Interpretation section supra especially with respect to the terminology “mini”.

Claim 6: See Figures and cited portions of ‘093 supra, i.e. the interval as seen in Figure2 is less than the length of 42 which is one third of the total length of the pad but more than the length of 58 which, preferably, is up to 10%, i.e. the interval is 10% to 80 of the total length of the pad. It is noted that what specific length of the face constitutes “a length in the longitudinal

Art Unit: 3761

direction” as claimed has not been explicitly claimed, e. any length in the longitudinal direction of the face is “a length”, not required to be, e.g., the maximum length or length along the longitudinal centerline.

Claim 7: See discussion supra in the Claim Language Interpretation section supra and with respect to claim 6 supra and 18 infra, the Response to Arguments section infra and the Figures. The ‘093 device includes at least some portion of the cavity opening at a location 40% from some portion of the pad which is in the front end, i.e. the front 50%, and at least some portion of the restriction is at a location 90% from some portion of the pad which is in the front end, i.e. the front 50%.

Claim 9: See Claim Language Interpretation section supra and Figures, esp. 2-3.

Claims 12-14: These claims recite functions, properties or capabilities of the structure set forth in claim 1. If not already taught by ‘093, see the portions cited supra, the ‘093 reference at the very least teaches such structure of claim 1. Therefore there is sufficient factual evidence for one to conclude that such same structure of ‘093 also inherently includes such claimed functions, properties and capabilities, see MPEP 2112.01.

Claim 18: Note again that what respective specific lengths of the mini-sheet and pad constitutes “a length” and a “longitudinal length” as claimed has not been explicitly claimed, i.e. any length or longitudinal length is “a length” or a “longitudinal length, respectively, e.g. see length from point in front of back end 42 and point in back of length 42 at lateral side edges in Figures 2-3 as compared to length of the longitudinal centerline, and paragraph bridging pages 26-27, i.e. longitudinal extension of aid is between 50% and 80% of a, i.e. some, “length” or “longitudinal length” of the pad.

Art Unit: 3761

Claim 21: See Figure 5b, i.e. the mini-sheet is attached so as to be in direct contact with the opposite face portions it covers except for the cavity therebetween and it is arranged at a portion of the cavity away from the end of portion 40 or laterally away from the opening, see, e.g., portions 60 in Figure 5b which are away or opposite to the cavity opening toward sides adjacent 51.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's remarks with respect to the informalities have been noted but are either deemed moot in that they have not been repeated or not persuasive for the reasons set forth supra. Applicant's remarks with respect to the prior art to Chappell have been considered but are deemed moot in that such rejection has not been repeated. It is noted that Applicants arguments regarding claim 7 on page 7, line -page 8, line 5 are narrower than the claim language. As noted supra, the claim terminology "front end" is not necessarily the front end edge nor does it require the opening and restriction be only at such percentage from the front end. Furthermore, the claim does not specify what the percentage is of, e.g. the overall longitudinal distance of the pad along the longitudinal centerline? The maximum distance of the pad from longitudinal end to longitudinal end? Any distance from end to end? Note, e.g., discussion of claims 6, 9 and 18.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


17. Any new grounds of rejection were necessitated by the amendments to claims 1, 6-7, 9, 12-14 and 18, the cancellation of claims 3-5 and the addition of claims 21-23.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karin M. Reichle whose telephone number is (571) 272-4936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Karin M. Reichle
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3761

KMR
August 2, 2007